

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 14 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Sinema
Casey	Markey	Smith
Collins	McConnell	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Portman	

NAYS—41

Blackburn	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Rubio
Braun	Hawley	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Cramer	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Wicker
Daines	Marshall	Young
Ernst	Moran	

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Romney
Luján	Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Esque Fleming, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCHATZ).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Fleming nomination?

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 15 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Sinema
Casey	Markey	Smith
Collins	McConnell	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Duckworth	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Graham	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Portman	

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Ernst	Moran
Blackburn	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Rubio
Braun	Hawley	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kennedy	Thune
Cramer	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Wicker
Daines	Marshall	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Luján	Romney
-------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 658, David Augustin Ruiz, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Gary C. Peters, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Sherrod Brown, Patty Murray, Tammy Duckworth, Tim Kaine, Elizabeth Warren, Mazie Hirono, Alex Padilla, Tina Smith, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Tester.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of David Augustin Ruiz, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 16 Ex.]

YEAS—59

Baldwin	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Capito	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	McConnell	Tillis
Coons	Menendez	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	

NAYS—38

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Wicker
Daines	Marshall	Young
Ernst	Moran	

NOT VOTING—3

Luján	Romney	Sanders
-------	--------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of David Augustin Ruiz, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

VIOLENT CRIME

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, everybody knows that violent crime is rising in America. Killings of police are at a 20-year high, the world's worst record since 9/11. Homicides, carjacking, and retail crime are all very high. Criminals are pushing people in front of the subways, looting entire trains filled with packages, and stealing so much from stores that the stores can't afford to stay open.

I have already come to this Senate floor many times to describe the horrors of increased attacks on police and the surge in murders. These tragedies cry out for action.

These are the results of campaigns to defund the police. Our streets are lawless because blue cities have pulled the

police back. The consequences of depolicing extend far beyond the violence that “defund the police” rhetoric inspires. It extends beyond criminals emboldened to commit crimes like murder and armed carjackings.

We have all seen the images of a California train yard littered with opened boxes as far as the eye can see. Train robberies are up by 160 percent in Los Angeles County, and that is just over the past year. The Governor of California compared the scenes to a Third World country. I have seen them, and I agree with the Governor of California.

Organized retail crime is out of control. Criminals rely on the lack of active policing to commit large-scale theft. According to the National Retail Federation, 69 percent of retailers say that they have had an increase in theft in the last year, and 78 percent say more law enforcement would help stop the crimes of retail theft.

Why would people not expect more law enforcement? Everybody knows that government is established for the public safety, among other reasons, but that is foremost.

It still isn't a secret what liberal cities need to do to keep crime out of their cities, out of their railways, out of their subways, out of their streets, and out of their stores. Send police where the crime happens. Tell the police to arrest criminals. Prosecute those criminals. Do not release dangerous criminals out on bail. It is a very simple and effective way to reduce the amount of crime.

Do you know what won't work? Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that the solution is gun control, but here is the issue: Gun control won't stop a criminal from pushing an innocent victim in front of a subway, let alone keep a criminal from obtaining an illegal gun.

The real problem is enforcement by the police. The crime spike began in June 2020 when blue cities nationwide pulled the police off their streets, progressive prosecutors at that time stopped prosecuting, and these blue cities started bail reform policies that released violent criminals into the street. No police on the streets but a lot of criminals on the streets—it is no surprise that crime has risen.

The problems are depolicing, political—progressive prosecution, and ineffective bail policies. Blue city mayors depoliced until some realized that was a bad, bad decision to make.

This liberal attitude toward criminality may now have a light at the end of the tunnel. It seems to be changing for the better.

Just two or three examples: New York City's new mayor, Eric Adams, announced that he would revive a plainclothes anticrime unit to combat the violence, and he is also suggesting better bail policies. A couple of months ago, we heard San Francisco Mayor London Breed declare a state of emergency over crime in her city. And then, maybe a month ago, we saw Chicago

Mayor Lori Lightfoot ask for Federal resources to fight crime.

The Nation's crime spike is the result of less law enforcement. Criminals are feeling bold—very bold—because they know they will go uncaught and, if uncaught, unpunished.

Far-left mayors need to use a simple solution with a very proven record of success. They need to bring police back to our streets and keep the criminals off of our streets.

(Mr. MURPHY assumed the Chair.)

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

On another matter, Mr. President, I want to talk about high drug prices.

Three years ago, I began a bipartisan effort to lower prescription drug costs. And that isn't just a Chuck Grassley issue; that is a bipartisan issue.

Following, first, Finance Committee hearings that I chaired, bipartisan negotiations, and a bill markup, I introduced with the senior Senator from Oregon a bill that we call Grassley-Wyden—but I don't care if it is called Wyden-Grassley. The point is the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act will go a long way to stop the massive increase we have in drug prices. We passed this bill out of the Finance Committee on a bipartisan vote of 19 to 9. I have never stopped working to advance a bipartisan, negotiated, and balanced drug pricing bill.

Drug prices are rising, and more Americans are having a harder time paying these high costs for prescription drugs. AARP says brand-name drugs that seniors use are going up at more than twice the rate of inflation. New data from another source, the National Health Interview Survey, estimates that 3.5 million seniors had difficulty affording their medication.

I hear stories about rising drug costs all the time at my 99 county meetings. We have a Q&A at every one of those meetings so people can bring up any subject they want to bring up. They set the agenda, and always prescription drug pricing is on that agenda. The people probably asking the question, “What are we going to do about prescription drug pricing?” are probably the very same ones who are being hit by these high prices, and they notice the big increase in prices from year to year.

As an example, Iowans tell me about the rising cost of their insulin or how they worry about paying for out-of-pocket costs in the doughnut hole. No matter how you look at it, drug costs are going up, and Americans are paying more.

For 12 months, President Biden and the Democratic majority has focused on a partisan reckless tax-and-spending spree, and they have not made any progress in passing drug pricing reform as part of their partisan proposal. I compliment them for trying to do something about drug pricing, but it hasn't happened yet, and the way you get things done in the U.S. Senate is by doing it in a bipartisan way.

By every public account, the talks in the other party on their agenda have

stalled. In fact, as best evidence of this, just this very day, the senior Senator from West Virginia said that the Democrat bill is—this is his word—“dead.”

So instead of spending more time on bills that do not have votes, we could pass bipartisan legislation to lower drug costs this very day. It would have a meaningful impact on lowering prescription drug costs. Let's not waste another minute.

So the Grassley-Wyden bill or the Wyden-Grassley bill remains our best chance to lower prescription drug costs in a bipartisan manner, and I urge my colleagues to work with me to pass this bill.

I will give you just some examples—probably only a half dozen out of 27 major pieces it has in it.

No. 1, it caps out-of-pocket costs at \$3,100. And I will have to give it to the Democrat proposal; they have reduced that down to \$2,000. I am willing to negotiate 3,100 or 2,000.

Secondly, it eliminates the doughnut hole.

Third, it caps rising drug prices in Medicare at the inflation price index.

Four, the bill ends uncapped taxpayer-funded subsidies for Big Pharma.

Five, it brings more sunshine, more competition, and more oversight to how Big Pharma prices drugs in the first place.

Lastly, out of 2,700 sections in this bill, I want to say it saves \$72 billion for seniors and \$95 billion for taxpayers.

In addition to this bill, I have four prescription drug bills that have passed the Judiciary Committee with unanimous support. So, obviously, all four of those are bipartisan bills.

These four bills bring more competition, let more affordable drugs come to the market, and end anticompetitive behavior by Big Pharma.

I urge my colleagues to work with me to pass bipartisan drug pricing reform today.

I will end by saying that, maybe early in the new administration, I had a telephone conversation with President Biden on the subject of drugs. He sent his legislative staff up here to meet with me on the subject. And I pointed out what they were trying to do, as I just pointed out to my colleagues today. They wanted to do it a different way; it doesn't seem to be getting traction. So I said to the President's staff—and I said to the President himself: You might want to take a look at this bipartisan bill, probably move it.

BIPARTISAN LEGISLATION

Mr. President, the other thing is—on another subject, but just a short statement. I had a chance within the last 3 hours to meet with another Senator with the President of the United States down at the White House on another subject.

But at the end of that meeting, I complimented the President on his Executive order—I think, of last June—in which he mandated to all agencies of